

Message

---

**From:** Glazer, Thomas [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=6578DEB6A4B042FFBE42A9854429FEB5-GLAZER, THO]  
**Sent:** 11/21/2016 9:17:30 PM  
**To:** Sweeney, Stephen [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=37ae2b769eab4231bdf19334e3651814-SSWEENEY]; Schroer, Lee [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=573fc5bb4942495d9fc3cd9438634244-LSCHROER]  
**Subject:** RE: This sounds reasonable to me ... FW: For Dave - thoughts on OA issue for OR list

Agree that this sound reasonable. But I definitely want to see the questions before they go out.

Tom Glazer  
USEPA Office of General Counsel  
Water Law Office  
7426N WJC North  
(202) 564-0908

---

**From:** Sweeney, Stephen  
**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 4:07 PM  
**To:** Schroer, Lee <schroer.lee@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Glazer, Thomas <glazer.thomas@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** This sounds reasonable to me ... FW: For Dave - thoughts on OA issue for OR list

Lee,

This is Region 10's plan

**Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

This sounds reasonable to me. Do you agree?

Thanks,

Steve

**Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

---

**From:** Fullagar, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 3:56 PM  
**To:** Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov>; Croxton, Dave <Croxton.David@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Havard, James <Havard.James@epa.gov>; Chemerys, Ruth <Chemerys.Ruth@epa.gov>; Lewicki, Chris <Lewicki.Chris@epa.gov>; Sweeney, Stephen <Sweeney.Stephen@epa.gov>; Glazer, Thomas <glazer.thomas@epa.gov>; Cora, Lori <Cora.Lori@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: For Dave - thoughts on OA issue for OR list

Hi Eric and Ruth,

Ruth—I got your message, but am in meetings the rest of the afternoon. I can give you a call tomorrow to talk through this some more.

I think our intention was to keep the request for comments pretty basic; Steve and Lori—correct me if you had other ideas.

**Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

**Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

We'll indicate that we know additional data will be available next summer. We would ask if anyone has any additional data for our consideration. I assume we will get comments about the known data and about whether or not we should list, in addition to any actual data we might receive. We may indicate that if, based on what we receive, we decide we should list, we would have an additional comment period. I don't have it drafted yet, but that was the general outline I had in mind. Anyone—please let me know if you have input.

As far as the other additions, our documents will be very similar to those we used last time, so aside from the listings themselves, the majority of the rest of the content will have already been through quite a bit of review. I hope to get something to you by the end of next week.

Tom—any word back re: the NOI? Thanks, and I'll get you something as soon as I have it. If you have pre-writing input, though, please send it my way now. Thx.

jill

---

Jill Fullagar, Impaired Waters Coordinator  
Watershed Unit, Office of Water and Watersheds  
US EPA, Region 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 (OWW-192)  
Seattle, WA 98101-3140  
(206) 553-2582, (206) 553-1280 (fax)  
[fullagar.jill@epa.gov](mailto:fullagar.jill@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Monschein, Eric

**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 12:26 PM

**To:** Croxton, Dave <[Croxton.David@epa.gov](mailto:Croxton.David@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Fullagar, Jill <[Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov](mailto:Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov)>; Havard, James <[Havard.James@epa.gov](mailto:Havard.James@epa.gov)>; Chemerys, Ruth <[Chemerys.Ruth@epa.gov](mailto:Chemerys.Ruth@epa.gov)>; Lewicki, Chris <[Lewicki.Chris@epa.gov](mailto:Lewicki.Chris@epa.gov)>; Sweeney, Stephen <[Sweeney.Stephen@epa.gov](mailto:Sweeney.Stephen@epa.gov)>; Glazer, Thomas <[glazer.thomas@epa.gov](mailto:glazer.thomas@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** For Dave - thoughts on OA issue for OR list

Dave – just a quick FYI to let you know that Ruth and I met with Jim Havard last week and got him up to speed on the key question you asked us (i.e., is HQ okay with the Region taking comment on the coast waters). As a general matter, we are leaning toward comfort. That said, however, we mentioned to Jim (and he agreed) that the questions you guys want to pose in the public notice are key to our comfort level.

**Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

**Attorney Client / Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

So, as a next step, let me propose that you guys share some language with us when you get it drafted.

Jill – different, but related, do you have a summary of the basis for adding the other 300 inland waters? As much as that has not been the focus of our conversation with you guys, we'll likely need to have some background on that to go along with the OA issue when we discuss this with Tom and Benita.

Cheers  
Eric